PTC/SB/21 (08-03)
Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0851-0091
U.S. Petent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE are regulred to respond to Application Number flection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Under the Pacerwork Reduction Act of 1995, no cemons RECEIVED 09/579.736 CENTRAL FAX CENTER TRANSMITTAL Filing Date May 26, 2000 FORM First Named Inventor Christian Buchler et al. 2653 tto be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Examiner Name Aristotella M. Psitos Attorney Docket Number PD880025 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Licensing-related Papers Fee Altached Appeal Communication to TC Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information Provisional Application After Final Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please Terminal Disclaimer Identify below): Extension of Time Request Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Reponse to Notice of Non-Compilant Appeal Brief mailled March 31, 2005 Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Flm Patricia A. Verlandieri, Attorney Thomson Inc. Individual name Signature Date May 2, 2005 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Typed or printed name Patricia A. Verlangieri May 2, 2005 Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by \$5 U.S.C. 122 and \$7 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PTO/SE/17 (10-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2005, OMB 0691-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to reapond to a collection of information unless it displays a velid OMB control number.

				T			<u> </u>	-	Complete If Know	יוֹיִי		
FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004					Application Number 09/579.736							
					Filing Date			May 26, 2000		HE	CEIVE	
101 F1 2004						First Named Inventor			tain Buchler et al	CENTRA	L FAX C	
Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.						Examiner Name			Aristotells M. Psitos		- 0 00	
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27								2653		0 2 20		
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 500						Attorney Dockot No.			PO990025			
ME	THOD OF PAYMENT	(check all that appl	v)					FEE C	ALCULATION (co	(beunim		
					3. ADI	OITIC	NAL FÉ	ES				
	redit card 🔲 Mon Ord		· VOILE	J.	Lerge_I	Enlliv	Small E	niky	•			
Deposit Accou	nt:				ėe .	Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee De	scription	Fee Paid	
Deposit					ode 051	(\$) 130	2051	( <b>5</b> ) 65	Surcharge - late	•		
Account Number	07-0832				062	60	2052	25	_	provisional filing fee	·	
Deposit Account THOMSON UCENSING INC., Customer No. 24499 Name				]   <sub>1</sub>	053	130	1053	130	Non-English spe	cification		
					612	2,520	1812	2,520	•	st for reexamination		
The Director is au	thorized to: (check	k all that apply)			804	920*	1804	920*	Raquesting publication	cation of SIA prior to	ــــا "	
☐ Charge fee(s) li	ndicated below 🛮 🖾 ditional fee(s) during	Credit any overpay the pendency of the	ris applicatio	ր   1	805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publi Examiner action	ication of SIR after		
Charge fee(s) L	ndicated below, exc	ept for the filing fo		- 1	251	110	2251	55		ily within first month		
to the above-identified deposit account.  FEE CALCULATION					262	430	2252	210	Extension for rep	nly within second		
1. BASIC FI	LING FEE	-		₁	253	980	2253	475		ly within third month	, <del>                                    </del>	
	Smail Entity				254	1,530	2254	740	Extension for rep			
Fee Fee F	eo Foe <u>Foe</u>	Description	Eac Bul-	Ι,	255	2,080	2255	1,005	month Extension for rea	aly within lifth month	.	
	iode (5) 001 389 Utilit	y filing tee	Fee Paid		401	340	2401	166	Notice of Appeal	•		
		ign illing fee		1 1	402	330	2402	165	-	upport of an appeal	500	
		il filing fee		<b>⊣</b> I	403	300	2403	145	Request for oral Petition to institu		$\vdash$	
		isuo liling too risional filling too	<b>—</b>	7 1	451	1,510	1451	1,510	proceeding			
		_			453 453	110 1,870	2453	65 885	Petition to revive Petition to revive			
SUBTOTAL (1) (\$) 0						1,370	2501	885 888	Utility leads fee (		$\vdash$	
2. EXTRA CLA	IM FEES FOR U				501 502	490	2502	240	Design issue fee	•		
	Ext Cla	tra Fee from	Féé Paid		503	660	2503	320	Plant issue fee			
Total Claims = 0 X = 0					460 807	130 50	1460	130 50	Petitions to the I	Director Inder 37 CFR 1.17 (	<u>,,                                   </u>	
ndépendent Xalms		×	] - 0	11	807	180	1806	50 150	Submission of Ir	inder 37 CFH 1.17 ( Iformation Disclosur	" —	
iulipio		─,;;	╡╞═	≓ ľ	500	100	1 100	100	Stmt			
ependent		×	] = [	<b>」∣</b> ₀	1021	40	6021	40	per property (tim	patent essignment es number of		
Lerge Entity Fee Fee	Small Entity Fee Fee	For Dona-t!		١,	609	790	2809	385	preparties) Filing a submiss	ion after final rejecti	on	
Code (\$)	Cade (5)	Fee Description	~		810	706	00.0	395	(97 ČFA § 1.129		<u> </u>	
1202 18 1201 88		Claims in excess of : Independent claims			810	790	2910	386	examined (37 C	nal invention to be FR § 1.129(b))		
1203 300	2203 145	Mulliple dependent of	daim, if not pa	uki 1	1801	790	2801	205	Request for Contin	ued Examination (RC	E)	
1204 <del>68</del>		** Reiseve independ original patent	lent claims ov	er	1802	900	1802	900	Request for exped		<del>  </del>	
1205 18	2205 0	** Reissue claims in	excess of 20	and					of a dealgn applic	alion		
1205 18 2205 9 Over original paters  SUBTOTAL (2) (8) 0						Other fee (epecify)						
SUBMITTED BY									Com	ploto (if applicable)		
Regi®ration No.						Т						
Name (Pnh/Typs)	Daniel A 14-		************	411			,201		Telaphane	(609) 734-6867		

WARNING: Information on this form may become subhic. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is powered by 35 U.5. 1.22 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to gate 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case, Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, anout be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.5. Patent and Trademark Office, U.5. Department of Commenter, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FREES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-900-PTC-9139 (1-500-766-9139) and select option 2.

PD990025

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

RECEIVED

Inventors

Christian Buchler et al.

**CENTRAL FAX CENTER** 

Serial No.

09/579,736

MAY 0 2 2005

Filed

May 26, 2000

Title

APPARATUS FOR SCANNING OPTICAL RECORDING

MEDIA USING A DIFFERENTIAL PHASE DETECTION

**METHOD** 

Examiner

Aristotelis M. Psitos

Art Unit

2653

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 2, 2005 at facsimile number (703) 872-9306.

Patricia A. Verlangieri

### APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 C. F. R. § 1.192

On July 29, 2004, Appellants filed a timely Notice of Appeal (that was received in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 29, 2004) from the action of the Examiner finally rejecting pending claims 1-17. The Appellants herein file this Brief in accordance with 37 C. F. R. § 1.192.

05/04/2005 NNGUYEN1 00000011 070832 09579736

01 FC:1402

500.00 DA

PD990025

## 1. IDENTIFICATION OF REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for the above-identified application is Thomson Inc., which is the assignee of the assignee of record for this application, Deutsche Thomson-Brandt GmbH.

## 2. IDENTIFICATION OF RELATED APPEALS OR INTERFERENCES

To the best of appellants' knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences that will be directly affected by, or will have a bearing on the decision of this appeal.

### 3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

The above-identified application was filed on May 26, 2000 claiming priority under 35 U. S. C. § 119 to German Patent Application No. 199 24 733.1 filed May 31 1999. Claims 1-17 were pending. In a Preliminary Amendment filed on May 26, 2000 claims 1-17 were amended.

A first Office Action was mailed September 10, 2003 (Paper No. 7), in which claims 1-17 were rejected.

In appellants' response to the first Office Action, dated March 10, 2004, claims 1, 8, 14 and 17 were amended.

The Examiner in a second Office Action was mailed April 29, 2004 (Paper No. 9), finally rejected claims 1-17.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Twice amended claims 1, 8, 14 and 17. Once amended claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15-16. All claims stand finally rejected.

PD990025

### 4. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

No amendments were made to the claims after final rejection. All amendments were entered.

## 5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for reading from or writing to optical recording media. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The apparatus includes a photodetector 10, a phase forming unit 13, an edge sequence detector 14 and a signal blocking unit 15. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, line 6 to page 9, line 16. The photodetector 10 includes at least two detector elements 10A, 10B, 10C, 10D. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, lines 23-32. The phase forming unit 13 detects a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector 10. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 2-4. The edge sequence detector 14 detects a sequence of edges of the output signals of the photodetector. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 4-8. The signal blocking unit 15, in response to the edge sequence detector 14, blocks output signals of the phase forming unit 13, when an impermissible sequence of edges is detected. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 8-16.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16.

Dependent claim 11 is directed to a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at

PD990025

page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 4, lines 29-33.

Dependent claim 12 is directed to a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 5, lines 9-16.

## 6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- 1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 13 and 17 as anticipated under 35 U. S. C. § 102(a) by Shiyuuichi (JP 10-198981).
- 2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10 and 17 as anticipated under 35 U. S. C. § 102(e) by Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396).
- 3. The Examiner has rejected claims 11-12 as being unpatentable under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) over Shiyuulchi (JP 10-198981) in view of Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396).

PD990025

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 11-12 as being unpatentable under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) over Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396) in view of Koji (JP 10-208262).

### 7. ARGUMENT

1. Rejection of claims 1-10, 13 and 17 under 35 U. S. C. § 102(a) over Shiyuuichi (JP 10-198981).

### Claims 1-9

Shiyuuichi discloses a tracking signal detector. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Problem to be Solved, lines 1-3. The time sequence of a single signal is checked for 3T and 4T signals. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Solution, lines 1-7. The tracking signal is annulled when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Solution, lines 7-10.

In appellant's claims 1-9, an apparatus is described for reading from or writing to optical recording media. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The apparatus includes a photodetector 10, a phase forming unit 13, an edge sequence detector 14 and a signal blocking unit 15. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, line 6 to page 9, line 16. The photodetector 10 includes at least two detector elements 10A, 10B, 10C, 10D. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, lines 23-32. The phase forming unit 13 detects a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector 10. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 2-4. The edge sequence detector 14 detects a sequence of edges of the output signals of the photodetector. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 4-8. The signal blocking unit 15, in response to the edge sequence detector 14, blocks output signals of the phase forming unit 13, when an impermissible sequence of edges is detected. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 8-16.

Shiyuuichi does not describe or suggest an apparatus for reading from or writing to optical recording media including a photodetector having at least two detector elements, a phase forming unit for detecting a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector, an edge sequence detector for detecting a sequence of edges of the output signals of the photodetector and a signal blocking unit that, in response to the edge sequence detector, blocks output signals of the phase forming unit when an impermissible sequence of edges is detected. Rather, Shiyuuichi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected. Therefore, appellant's submit that claims 1-9 are not anticipated by Shiyuuichi.

## Claims 10, 13 and 17

Appellant's claims 10, 13 and 17 disclose a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16.

Shiyuuichi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected. Rather, Shiyuuichi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected. Therefore, appellant's submit that claims 10, 13 and 17 are not anticipated by Shiyuulchi.

2. Rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 U. S. C. § 102(a) over Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396).

### Claims 1-3, 6 and 9

Kuribayashi discloses a tracking error generating device. See Kuribayashi at column 1, lines 5-8. In the tracking error generating device, evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals are individually checked for amplitude or line width. See Kuribayashi at column 2, lines 48-67.

In appellant's claims 1-3, 6 and 9, an apparatus is described for reading from or writing to optical recording media. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The apparatus includes a photodetector 10, a phase forming unit 13, an edge sequence detector 14 and a signal blocking unit 15. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, line 6 to page 9, line 16. The photodetector 10 includes at least two detector elements 10A, 10B, 10C, 10D. See appellant's specification at FIG. 1 and page 8, lines 23-32. The phase forming unit 13 detects a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector 10. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 2-4. The edge sequence detector 14 detects a sequence of edges of the output signals of the photodetector. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 4-8. The signal blocking unit 15, in response to the edge sequence detector 14, blocks output signals of the phase forming unit 13, when an impermissible sequence of edges is detected. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 8-16.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest an apparatus for reading from or writing to optical recording media including a photodetector having at least two detector elements, a phase forming unit for detecting a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector, an edge sequence detector for detecting a sequence of edges of the output signals of the photodetector and a signal blocking unit that, in response to the edge sequence detector, blocks output signals of the phase forming unit when an impermissible sequence of edges is

PD990025

detected. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different arrangement in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claims 1-3, 6 and 9 are not anticipated by Kuribayashi.

### Claims 10 and 17

Appellant's claims 10 and 17 disclose a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different method in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claims 10 and 17 are not anticipated by Kuribayashi.

3. Rejection of claims 11-12 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) over Shiyuuichi (JP 10-198981) in view of Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396).

### Claim 11

Shiyuuichi discloses a tracking signal detector. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Problem to be Solved, lines 1-3. The time sequence of a single signal is checked for 3T and 4T signals. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Solution, lines 1-7. The tracking signal is annulled when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected. See Shiyuuichi in Abstract, Solution, lines 7-10.

In appellant's claim 11, a method is disclosed for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The Impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 4, lines 29-33.

Shiyuulchi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. Rather, Shiyuuichi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low

signal-to-noise ratios are detected. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 11 patentable over Shiyuuichi.

Kuribayashi discloses a tracking error generating device. See Kuribayashi at column 1, lines 5-8. In the tracking error generating device, evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals are individually checked for amplitude or line width. See Kuribayashi at column 2, lines 48-67.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different method in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 11 patentable over Kuribayashi.

Further, since Shiyuulchi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected and Kuribayashi only teaches detecting tracking error signals based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 11. In particular, claim 11 recites a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero

PD990025

crossing in another of the signals. Thus, claim 11 is not obvious over Shiyuuichi in view of Kuribayashi.

### Claim 12

In appellant's claim 12, a method is disclosed for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 5, lines 9-16.

Shiyuuichi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Rather, Shiyuuichi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 12 patentable over Shiyuuichi.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of

checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different method in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 12 patentable over Kuribayashi.

Further, since Shiyuuichi only teaches checking the timing sequence of a single signal for 3T and 4T signals and annulling the tracking signal when 3T and 4T signals with low signal-to-noise ratios are detected and Kuribayashi only teaches detecting tracking error signals based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 12. In particular, claim 12 recites a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Thus, claim 12 is not obvious over Shiyuuichi in view of Kuribayashi.

4. Rejection of claims 11-12 under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) over Kuribayashi (U. S. 6,317,396) in view of Koji (JP 10-208262).

### Claim 11

Kuribayashi discloses a tracking error generating device. See Kuribayashi at column 1, lines 5-8. In the tracking error generating device, evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals are individually checked for amplitude or line width. See Kuribayashi at column 2, lines 48-67.

In appellant's claim 11, a method is disclosed for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 4, lines 29-33.

Kuribayashi discloses a tracking error generating device. See Kuribayashi at column 1, lines 5-8. In the tracking error generating device, evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals are individually checked for amplitude or line width. See Kuribayashi at column 2, lines 48-67. In appellant's claim 11, a method is disclosed for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence

PD990025

of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 4, lines 29-33.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different method in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 11 patentable over Kuribayashi.

Koji describes a tracking signal detector. See Koji in Abstract, Problem to be Solved, line 1. The tracking error signal is detected based on whether a phase difference occurs within a prescribed time. See Koji in Abstract, Solution, lines 1-9.

Koji does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. Rather, Koji only teaches detecting a tracking error signal based on whether a phase difference occurs within a prescribed time. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 11 patentable over Koji.

Further, since Kuribayashi only teaches detecting tracking error signals based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output

PD990025

signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width and Koji only teaches detecting a tracking error signal based on whether a phase difference occurs within a prescribed time, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 11. In particular, claim 11 recites a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals. Thus, claim 11 is not obvious over Kuribayashi in view of Koji.

#### Claim 12

In appellant's claim 12, a method is disclosed for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method. See appellant's specification at page 1, lines 7-11. The method includes checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence. See appellant's specification at page 9, lines 6-10. Thereafter, the outputting of a phase value is prevented when the impermissible sequence is detected. See appellants' specification at page 9, lines 10-16. The impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. See appellant's specification at page 5, lines 9-16.

Kuribayashi does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when

the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Rather, Kuribayashi teaches a completely different method in which tracking error signals are detected based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 12 patentable over Kuribayashi.

Koji does not describe or suggest a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Rather, Koji only teaches detecting a tracking error signal based on whether a phase difference occurs within a prescribed time. Therefore, appellant's submit that claim 11 patentable over Koji.

Further, since Kuribayashi only teaches detecting tracking error signals based on evaluation target signals processed from light receiving element output signals that are individually checked for amplitude or line width and Koji only teaches detecting a tracking error signal based on whether a phase difference occurs within a prescribed time, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 12. In particular, claim 12 recites a method for determining a correct track error signal using a phase detection method including the steps of checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequence and preventing the outputting of a phase value when the impermissible sequence is detected, where the impermissible sequence is a sequence of more than one

PD990025

pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals. Thus, claim 12 is not obvious over Kuribayashi in view of Koji.

## 8. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-17 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney

Reg. No. 42,201 (609) 734-6867

Patent Operations
Thomson Inc.
P. O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

May 2, 2005

PD990025

### <u>APPENDIX I - APPEALED CLAIMS</u>

- 1. An apparatus for reading from or writing to optical recording media, comprising:
  - a photodetector with at least two detector elements;
- a phase forming unit for detecting a phase difference between output signals of the photodetector;
- an edge sequence detector for detecting a sequence of edges of the output signals; and
- a signal blocking unit for blocking an output signal of the phase forming unit when an impermissible sequence of edges is detected.
- 2. The apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the signal blocking unit blocks a signal which is derived from the output signal of the phase forming unit or is used to form the output signal.
- 3. The apparatus according to Claim 2, further comprising diagonal summation signal forming units having inputs connected to the detector elements of the photodetector and providing the output signal.
- 4. The apparatus according to Claim 3, further comprising edge detectors and phase angle detectors, to which the output signals are fed and whose outputs are connected to the phase forming unit and to the edge sequence detector.
- 5. The apparatus according to Claim 2, further comprising edge detectors and phase angle detectors, to which the output signals are fed and whose outputs are connected to the phase forming units and to the edge sequence detector.

PD990025

- 6. The apparatus according to Claim 1, further comprising diagonal summation signal forming units having inputs connected to the detector elements of the photodetector and providing the output signal.
- 7. The apparatus according to Claim 1, further comprising edge detectors and phase angle detectors, to which the output signals are fed and whose outputs are connected to the phase forming unit and to the edge sequence detector.
- 8. The apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the phase forming unit and the edge sequence detector are integrated.
- 9. The apparatus according to Claim 1, further comprising a fault indicator connected to an output of the edge sequence detector.
- 10. A method for determining a correct track error signal utilizing a phase detection method, comprising the steps of:

checking a sequence of zero crossings whose phases are detected with regard to impermissible sequences; and

preventing the outputting of a phase value when an impermissible sequence is detected.

- 11. The method of Claim 10, wherein a sequence of more than two successive zero crossings of one of the signals without the occurrence of a zero crossing in another of the signals is an impermissible sequence.
- 12. The method of Claim 10, wherein a sequence of more than one pair of zero crossings within a predetermined time period, a pair of zero crossings consisting of a zero crossing of one of the signals and a succeeding zero crossing of another one of the signals, is an impermissible sequence.

PD990025

- 13. The method of Claim 10, wherein an error indication signal is generated as a function of the accumulation of impermissible sequences.
- 14. The method of Claim 10, wherein the signals are evaluated in a predetermined clock cycle, a zero crossing being present if one of two successive values of the signal lies above, and the other of said values lies below, a reference value, and the temporal positions of the zero crossing is interpolated using these two values.
- 15. The method of Claim 14, wherein the phase value between a zero crossing of one signal of the signals and a zero crossing of another of the signals is determined from the respective interpolated temporal position and the number of clock cycles lying between the zero crossings.
- 16. The method of Claim 10, further comprising the step of extrapolating the track error signal in the event of an impermissible sequence.
- 17. The method of Claim 10, wherein the phase detection method is a differential phase detection method, the signals to be compared being the diagonal summation signals.

Approved for use through 07/31/2008 OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a callection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number

#### Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office

on May 2, 2005.

Date

Patricia A. Verlangieri Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Serial No.: 09/579,736 Docket No.: PD990025

Art Unit: 2653

Examiner: Aristotelis M. Psitos

Transmittal Form (2 Copies - 2 Pages) Fee Transmittal Form (2 Copies - 2 Pages)

Appeal Brief (20 - Pages)

This collection of Information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a banefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentially is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and \$7 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual contracts on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce. P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.